13

The Truth About Ireland in the Great War

An Analysis of Admiral Sims' Unfair Attack On the Irish People

---

IRISH NATIONAL BUREAU

Daniel T. O'Connell, Director Katherine Hughes, Secretary

Washington, D. C.

Issued by the Section of Information

Willard DeLue, Chief

Explanatory Note

The attack made upon the people of Ireland, and, indirectly, upon the American supporters of the Irish Republic, by Rear Admiral William Sowden Sims, U. S. N., in an article which he contributed to the November, 1919, number of The World's Work, is one of the most audacious attempts to creat anti-Irish sentiment which has ever been made in the United States. Admiral Sims went to extremes which no English statesman dared attempt. It was to show Admiral Sims' pro-English sympathies and the unfairness of his attack that the Irish National Bureau, through its director, Daniel T. O'Connell, LL. D. (former Captain, U. S. A.), a member of the American Bar Association, wrote to Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, and to Admiral Sims himself. Every lover of truth and of fair play should read this pamphlet.

Washington, D. C., November, 1919.

Contents

	Page
What Sims Wrote	3
Irish National Bureau's Letter to Secretary Daniels	5
Secretary Daniels' Reply	7
Irish National Bureau's Letter to Admiral Sims	8
Note transmitting copy of letter of Admiral Sims to Secretary Daniels	15
Admiral Sims acknowledges receipt of letter from Irish National Bureau	15
Secretary Daniels acknowledges receipt of copy of letter to Admiral Sims	15
Second letter from the Irish National Bureau to Secretary Daniels	16
Ireland's Contribution in the World War	18

Topical Index will be found on page 20.

How Admiral William Sowden Sims Writes History

From "The World's Work" for November, 1919.

For a period of ten days the Irish National Bureau reserved the space represented by this page, the succeeding page and part of page 5 for a reprint of the Sims attack on the people of Ireland. The original article, as published in "The World's Work" magazine was copyrighted, and permission was asked of Doubleday, Page & Company, the publishers, to reprint it with our answer to his charges.

The following answer, under date of November 26, 1919, was duly received:

"THE WORLD'S WORK
"GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

"November 26, 1919.

"DEAR SIR:

"This is merely to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, which will be brought up immediately after Thanksgiving. Our usual rule is not to allow reprints. but this case is somewhat different than the usual requests.

"Very truly yours,
(Signed) "VIOLA H. NULTY.

"MR. DANIEL T. O'CONNELL,
"Irish National Bureau,
"Washington, D. C."

The Sims attack was set in type, and space reserved for its use. Having waited a reasonable time for permission to use the exact words of Admiral Sims, the Irish National Bureau is compelled to arrive at the conclusion that the publishers do not care to waive the copyright restrictions; silence must be construed as a refusal. The spirit of fairness which influenced the Irish National Bureau to use the Sims article, so that readers of the replies could have all the essential facts of the controversy before them, has not been met in similar spirit by the publishers. The Irish National Bureau could not be expected to wait longer; and it would not beg for the privilege.

As it is probable that other chapters, adding to the unpleasant duty of compelling Admiral Sims to be fair and just, may be written and published, the Irish National Bureau may later have the privilege of reproducing the exact language of Admiral Sims.

The attention of readers and historians is also called to the fact that no further reply has been received from Admiral Sims than his communication of November 12 (see page 15). Believing Admiral Sims should be accorded reasonable time for a full and complete answer, the Irish National Bureau waited patiently. Admiral Sims, however, apparently desires to have the flippant, undignified and typically British acknowledgment of November 12 stand as his reply. Fair-minded Americans may judge for themselves whether the attitude of Admiral Sims is what is expected of an officer of the United States Navy.

(Signed) DANIEL T. O'CONNELL,
Director, Irish National Bureau.

Dec. 2, 1919.

See explanatory statement on page 3.

See explanatory statement on page 3.

Irish National Bureau's Protest to Secretary Daniels

THE HONORABLE
JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

The Irish National Bureau respectfully calls your attention to an article by Admiral William Sowden Sims in the November issue of "The World's Work", which embodies an open insult to millions of American citizens. The article inferentially charges these loyal Americans with allying themselves with a cause which was openly hostile to America in the great war. Admiral Sims asserts than Sinn Fein, which is synonymous with the Irish Republican movement, was not only "openly disloyal" but "openly pro-German". He charges that, as the result of this pro-Germanism, Sinn Feiners attacked American sailors in the streets of Cork and that these attacks became so serious that it was necessary to bar our American boys from the city.

The Irish National Bureau, speaking for millions of citizens of the United States who are of Irish blood, and who are solidly behind the Irish Republic, wishes to enter an emphatic protest against an officer of the United States Navy making use of his name and official position to give credence and dignity to oft-repeated statements which are either wholly false or bald misinterpretation of facts. Such statements, were they leveled alone at the Irish people, might well be resented by their friends in this country; and when they become part of a bitter campaign of invective directed not alone at Ireland but at Americans of Irish blood, they become a serious affront to a very considerable proportion of the people of the United States.

Admiral Sims' contribution is one of the most radical of an ever-increasing volume of attack emanating from the country under whose flag he was born. As you must fully realize, Mr. Secretary, he will be regarded by the world as an authoritative spokesman for the United States Navy and, as such, his statements will be accepted without question as the truth. It is essential, therefore, that the unfounded charges against Sinn Fein which Admiral Sims makes must be corrected or withdrawn in justice to millions of Admiral Sims' fellow-citizens in America, and for the honor of the United States Navy, whose officers have never knowingly lent their names to any campaign of misrepresentation.

That part of the article in which Admiral Sims asserts that Sinn Fein was pro-German

contains no substantiation of the charge, save that some American sailors were attacked in the streets of Cork. Admiral Sims lays all the trouble at the feet of Sinn Fein and points an indicting finger directly at "a delegation claiming to represent the Irish Republic" headed by President De Valera, which now is touring the United States. It is because of the intense interest evinced in the United States in the Irish situation that Admiral Sims presumes to make his uncalled-for attack upon the Irish Republic. For the same reason, then, the Irish National Bureau feels called upon to openly resent the Admiral's act.

But there is another reason and a far more important one. For years English writers have been embarked in a never-ceasing campaign of misrepresentation not only of Ireland and its people but of those of Irish blood in the United States. The achievements of these Americans have been minimized and their motives questioned; and American writers (some unsuspectingly, others with set purpose) have repeated these misstatements until our history and literature have in part become a tissue of untruths designed to create acrimonious discussion among our citizenry, and break down its solidarity. Admiral Sims' article is another contribution to this cause.

Admiral Sims attempts to cast odium on Eamon De Valera, the duly chosen President of the Irish Republic, who is now being acclaimed by millions of American citizens, a large proportion of whom are not of Irish blood. It is such odium that was cast by the British at George Washington before our Republic was recognized, in a time when American delegates were at Paris urging recognition, when La Fayette came to America to help us win freedom, and when Franklin, seeking aid from Ireland, pledged America's support to the Irish people in their own struggle for independence. I append, Mr. Secretary, a copy of that pledge.

No attempt will be made in this letter to show how erroneous are the statements to which Admiral Sims lends his name and the name of the United States Navy. Within three days, the Irish National Bureau will point out to Admiral Sims the truth of the things about which he writes. We beg to call your attention, however, to the fact that Sinn Fein which the Admiral denounces was supported by the great mass of the Irish electorate on December 14, 1918. In a total of one hundred Parliamentary constituencies seventy-two Sinn Fein candidates were elected, many of them without opposition, and in the other electoral districts a heavy Sinn Fein vote was recorded. An attack, therefore, upon Sinn Fein is an attack upon the bulk of the Irish people.

Now, Mr. Secretary, every American admires the men of our Navy—enlisted men and officers. The great majority of them always conduct themselves as clean-living American citizens. They are gentlemen always. But there are others—and all naval officers are fully aware of the fact—who require stricter discipline on shore and on ship. Left to their own caprice, they sometimes invite sharp criticism and very frequently the corrective discipline of civilian law and regulations, as well as preventive restraint.

Certainly, if the conduct of every man in the American Navy was always above criticism, or, if it were never necessary to check excesses of the spirit which tradition and song tell us is the life of the sailor, it would have been unnecessary to have maintained heavy naval police patrols in New York, Boston, and elsewhere in America, where large numbers of sailors were assembled.

This is not criticism of the American Navy. It is a mere statement of fact. And who will say that our boys, away from the restraining influences of home and of native country, did not—some of them—indulge in the same excesses as in home ports?

President Eamon De Valera has stated plainly that the attacks at Cork on American sailors were, in part, the result of a determination of the Irish manhood to protect Irish women. President De Valera went further and said that, with the same situation confronting them today, the men of Cork would inflict the same punishment as before. Any red-blooded man would applaud this course provided just cause was given. And President De Valera, a scholar of distinction honored even by his enemies, for his uprightness, stated, after careful inquiry, that such cause did exist.

Ireland through the world has ever been

noted for the virtue of its women. Even her most bitter enemies have not denied her the right of maintaining a standard of national morality that has compelled the praise of all civilized people.

Admiral Sims could well have paid tribute to the men of Ireland, if a purpose to be fair to Ireland and its menfolk had guided his pen. He seeks to make it appear the men of Ireland (classifying them as Sinn Fein) were not performing their share of the duty confronting the world in overthrowing the German autocracy. What is his object in conveying that impression if it is not to direct criticism at Ireland?

You, Mr. Secretary, are in a position to obtain official figures and can verify the following:

Our own great country, with its magnificent generosity in men and resources, gave 22 per cent of its total man power of military age; Ireland gave 36 per cent. The United States contributed 4 per cent of its total population; Ireland contributed 6.5 per cent. And bear in mind that enlistments in Ireland were voluntary.

In view of the foregoing figures, (a fair test of whether the men of Ireland were fighting or "insulting American sailors"), is it fair that an officer of the United States Navy should slander the male population of Ireland and supply statements which, unless corrected, historians and writers of the present and future will be warranted in quoting? For your guidance, I attach herewith a printed statement issued October 16, 1919, by the Irish National Bureau, and signed by me, as Director. It supplies additional data which will enable you to understand more clearly how unfair Admiral Sims has been.

If it is the intention of Admiral Sims to permit to be published in book form or otherwise the same writings herein complained of, the Irish National Bureau requests that you, as his superior, direct that such changes be made as will accord justice, and only justice, to the people of Ireland. and which will free millions of American citizens from the imputation of giving moral and financial support to America's enemies; and that Admiral Sims be told that he needlessly leaves the paths of the historian to say unkind words of a people who supplied to the American Navy some of its best officers and men; and finally that, by attacking those of Irish blood in Ireland and in America, he is lending encouragement to a form of English propaganda that will be used to the disadvantage of the United States Navy whenever it serves the selfish interests of the English to do so.

So that you, Mr. Secretary, may know the truth—if, indeed, the records at your disposal do not tell it—the Irish National Bureau will furnish you with a copy of its communication to Admiral Sims as soon as it is prepared.

In conclusion, may we call your attention to the fact that Admiral Sims, 1910, in a speech at the Guildhall, gave utterance to words of extreme pro-English sympathies which awakened widespread adverse comment and occasioned official embarrassment. Admiral Sims, in his recent article, makes reference to that incident. He seems to find in it a reason for now proclaiming that, with prophetic accuracy, he had correctly read the future; and apparently he finds in it also reason to believe that he can again give voice to pro-English views with impunity. It would appear, however, that the Guildhall blunder of 1910 now is duplicated by Admiral Sims in his unwarranted attacks upon the Irish people and upon his fellow-citizens of Irish blood.

Respectfully,
DANIEL T. O'CONNELL,
Director.

November the first, 1919.

Secretary Daniels' Reply

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
WASHINGTON

NOVEMBER 4, 1919.

MY DEAR SIR:

I am in receipt of your favor of November 1st, and am referring it to Admiral Sims. When he returned from Europe upon the conclusion of his service as head of the American naval forces abroad, he requested permission to write a series of articles upon

the Navy and its service in Europe, and the Department granted permission. He has published his articles without censorship by the Department because it could rely upon his judgment. I am sure Admiral Sims will be glad to have you furnish him a statement, and if he has made any statement in his articles based upon misinformation he will be very glad to correct it.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

MR. DANIEL T. O'CONNELL, *Director,*
IRISH NATIONAL BUREAU,
Washington, D. C.

Irish National Bureau Tells the Truth to Admiral Sims

FROM: Daniel T. O'Connell, Director, Irish National Bureau.
To: William Sowden Sims, Admiral, U.S.N., Washington, D. C.

SUBJECT: Article in "The World's Work".

1. The Irish National Bureau, making due allowance for your right as a citizen to publish the story of your war experiences, respectfully enters protest against your course as an officer of the United States Navy in promulgating statements which, with directness of accusation, but indirectness of supporting evidence of fact, constitute slander of the vast majority of the people of Ireland, and offend grievously 20,000,000 Americans of Irish blood who, with hearts ever loyal to the Stars and Stripes, cannot forget that their blood is wholly or partly the same as that which courses through the veins of those whom you attack.

2. Secretary Daniels has informed us that our letter to him under date of November 1 has been referred to you. In that letter we wrote that a further protest would be made to you, personally. Will you, therefore, consider the facts set forth in the letter to the Secretary as a part of the general protest, thereby making it unnecessary for us now to repeat them in their entirety.

3. Before giving detailed answer to your attack, it is right that you should know from whom the answer comes, that you may have a clearer understanding of the views which we express. The signer is an American citizen; he was born and reared in Boston, Mass. Both his parents were born in Cork County, Ireland, and, like millions of other men and women, were forced by conditions, born of British misgovernment, to come at an early age to the United States to obtain for themselves and for their children the blessings of liberty which this nation, having thrown off England's oppression, offered to the oppressed peoples of the world; his father in the Civil War served in the United States Navy; and the signer himself, in the recent war, served as a captain in the Judge Advocate General's Section of the United States Army and at present holds a commission in the Reserve; and, when the selective service regulations were put into operation, he was appointed Provost Marshal of his home district and subsequently was Government Appeal Agent; and later, upon recommendation of the American Bar Association served the Department of Labor as a Field Organizer for the United States Employment Service. The signer was for several years an officer, for a time President, of the Boston University Law School Association, which today numbers among its members five of the seven Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts For references to his standing in the community and as a member of the Bar, and of his willingness to be fair in any controversy in which engaged, you are at liberty to inquire of any member of the Massachusetts Judiciary or the United States Judiciary of the Massachusetts District, or of the officers of the Boston Bar Association, the Massachusetts Bar Association, or the American Bar Association, in all of which the signer holds membership. This personal reference would not be included herewith were it not that a previous protest from the Irish National Bureau to Secretary Daniels has

roused widespread comment, and that you, erhaps, may with reason insist upon knowng the standing of the person who, as Diector of this Bureau, protests against your vritings.

4. The burden of your attack is as folows:

(a) That Sinn Fein was pro-German and that it not only failed to contribute towards the winning of the war, but positively sought to prevent success by the Allies;

(b) That this active pro-Germanism showed itself in attacks upon American sailors in the streets of Cork;

(c) That President De Valera of the Irish Republic, now in the United States, is one of "this same brotherhood" and consequently represents a cause unworthy of American encouragement and support;

(d) And, indirectly, but none the less clearly, that American citizens in large numbers are supporting morally and financially a movement which is inimical to the best interests of the United States.

5. In support of these statements, all of which are based upon gross misrepresentation of facts, you offer nothing but indefinite, indirect, and unfair generalizations.

6. It is represented to the Irish National Bureau, however, that the actual writing of the article in question was not done by you, but that it is the work of another who, though perhaps more accustomed to expressing himself in writing, was handicapped by dependence upon mere fragments from your experience, contributed in part by you and in part by unsupported statements which previously had appeared in the press of the United States. It will be helpful to a proper understanding if you will state definitely and unofficially whether you are or are not the writer of the article in question, and, if it is not entirely the child of your pen, to what extent any other person assisted in its preparation.

7. You say: "There is a certain pertinence in informing Americans just what kind of treatment their brave sailors met with AT SINN FEIN HANDS IN IRELAND." The capitalization is ours. We desire to point out to you that this will be accepted by the American people as a sweeping indictment not alone of Sinn Fein in Cork, but of Sinn Fein as a whole. Now, since the war began, English sailors have been attacked while in American ports; but would you approve if Sir Edward Carson condemned the entire American people or the rank and file of either the Republican or the Democratic party because of these happenings? If the attack took place in Philadelphia, which is Republican, should the Republican party be condemned? Or, if it took place in Boston, which is Democratic, would you hold Sir Edward Carson justified in slandering the entire Democratic party and of pointing a condemning finger at President Wilson? For, in attacking Sinn Fein, Admiral Sims, you are attacking the great mass of the Irish people. In the last Parliamentary election, December 14, 1918, out of 105 constituencies in Ireland, Sinn Fein secured seventy-three (73), the Dillon Nationalists six (6), and the Unionists twenty-six (26). Of the Nationalists, two (2) had declared for self-determination for Ireland, and were, consequently, unopposed by Sinn Fein. With these figures before you, can you honestly believe that you have been just to the people of Ireland in condemning Sinn Fein because of occurrences in a single city; occurrences with which, in fact, Sinn Fein had no connection?

8. May we point out to you other misstatements in your article which, guaranteed by your name, and by the traditional integrity of the official personnel of our Navy, will be accepted without question by the world as the truth. You say that our American boys "were disgusted at the large numbers of able-bodied men whom they saw on the streets and did not hesitate to ask some of them why they were not fighting on the western front." Inquiry will show you that the Irish people gave nobly and willingly of their best blood. As pointed out by us in our letter to Secretary Daniels, 6.5 per cent of the total population of the country and 36 per cent of the total male population of military age voluntarily enlisted and served under the British flag;

whereas, our own enlistments, voluntary and by draft, did not, so far as we are able to ascertain, equal 5 per cent of the total population, nor more than 22 per cent of our male population of military age. You are familiar with the workings of the Selective Service Draft and must realize that we in America exempted the married men with dependents, those engaged in essential industrial or agricultural work, minors and the incapacitated. Surely we in America did our full share; yet Ireland on a basis of population, gave proportionately more, and gave to fight under a flag which to Irishmen has always stood as the emblem of an oppressor of small nations, and the enemy of the very principles for which we in America sent our boys to fight. Would you say that Ireland was not entitled to the same exemptions for military service that we in America believed humane and just? From the days of the famine to the present, emigration from Ireland has been largely of the younger men. As a result of this drain upon the best of her youth, the proportion of the infirm and the aged is higher in Ireland than in England or in America. Yet, in spite of this, total enlistments in Ireland were 275,592. By what authority, therefore, can you intimate that Ireland did not bear her full share of the burden in this war? Your bitterness of attack exceeds that of the English. Would you have stripped Ireland of the married, the minors, the physically incapacitated, and those who would have had valid claim to exemption had a Selective Service law such as ours prevailed in Ireland? In the course of the war, "large numbers of able-bodied men" walked the streets of every city and town in our land. They were the married, the minors and the exempted industrialists. Yet there was no criticism. In the course of the war, "large numbers of able-bodied men" walked the streets in Orange processions in Belfast. (Freeman's Journal, July 13, 1918, p. 5, col. 4.) Again there was no criticism. And the men of Cork should not be criticized by you. Ireland did her full share in the great war. Upon every battlefield of France and of Belgium, upon the hills of Salonica and in the blood-stained gulches of the Dardanelles, Irish blood flowed freely in the glorious cause of small nations. English history and English governmen failed to acknowledge that service unti practically forced to do so; and your con tribution to the history of the war is in thi respect another instance of history distort ed. Furthermore, lest you think, perhaps that these men who fought and died wer not Sinn Fein at heart, allow us to again re mind you that three-quarters of the peopl of Ireland in the last election expresse their allegiance to Sinn Fein, and by n misapplication of logic can this great mas of the Irish population be disassociate from their sons and brothers who fough with the Allies. And, if there still be ques tion, we will quote you from the Londo Daily Express of October 23, 1919: "Th bulk of the Irish soldiers demobilized fron the British Army have joined the Repub lican (i. e., Sinn Fein) force, giving it foundation of experienced veterans." Her is testimony from an English source. You charge against the manhood of Irelan should be, by every rule of fairness, with drawn or corrected.

9. You say: "The people of Queenstow and of Cork received our men with genuin Irish cordiality. Yet within a few weeks evidence of hostility in certain quarters be came apparent." You admit that for while all went well. And then you charg that the cause of the change was hatred o our boys because they were not pro German. Is not this upon the face of i ridiculous? Could any sane individual—n matter how pro-German himself—even ex pect American sailors to be pro-German Would any man of normal mind battle wit them on the streets because they were not But even here you contradict yourself, fo again you say: "But when the Sinn Fei element saw their sweethearts desertin them for American boys, their hitherto sup pressed anger took the form of overt acts." First, may we ask you, what form had thi "hitherto suppressed anger" previously taken? You mention no such form, unles it be the enthusiastic pro-American welcom to the Fleet on May 4 (p. 40) which yo describe. Yet, if there were no evidence o it, how do you know that there was an such anger? Do you read men's thoughts? You clearly state that it was not until the

women came on the scene that there was trouble. How then, in the name of all that is truth, can you charge, in one breath, that the attacks upon the sailors were made upon grounds of political hostility and, in the next, that the cause was a fuss over women? How far would such testimony go in our American courts of law?

10. And then you say: "The fact is that the part of Ireland in which the Americans were stationed was a headquarters for Sinn Fein. The members of this organization were not only openly disloyal, they were openly pro-German". First, may we ask, to whom were they disloyal? Secondly, we respectfully challenge you to prove that they were pro-German. You say: "They were not even neutral—they were working day and night for a German victory. . . . It was no secret that the Sinn Feiners were sending information to Germany, and constantly laying plots to interfere with the British and American Navy". Again we say: prove it. Tell America and tell Ireland what Ireland and its friends in America have long been trying to find out. What is the basis for these charges of German plots and of sending information to Germany? Edward Shortt proclaimed similar plots and failed to substantiate in the slightest measure his claim, though he has been challenged to do so and taunted for his failure. Proclaiming German plots in Ireland is not a new occupation, Sir. We now respectfully ask you to prove your claims. For you must know. You say that you do. You say: "It was no secret." If it was no secret, from whence came your information? Was it from Captain Evans, R. N., who was detailed by the British Admiralty to act as liaison officer with the American Flotilla, or from Vice-Admiral Sir Lewis Bayly, also of the British Navy, who actually had command of the United States Destroyer Flotilla in Irish waters? If your information came from them, Admiral Sims, it must be plain to you that it came from a polluted source. But, whether the source was reliable or not, give us the information you claim to possess.

11. Again, you say: "The behavior of the American sailors was good". It is not for us, Admiral Sims, to question the behavior of American sailors in port. We know them. They are among our friends. The Irish National Bureau, speaking for millions of American citizens, speaks for many of the men who served under you. They are in our organizations; they have contributed their dollars to Ireland's cause; they ride today with De Valera! But, the word "good", Admiral Sims, is a comparative term. Certainly, our boys were no better in Ireland than they were at home. And we beg to call to your attention that here in America, wherever large bodies of our sailor boys were assembled, it was found necessary to maintain armed navy police patrols to restrain that small percentage to whom "liberty" sometimes meant license. This, as the Irish National Bureau has said before, is not an attack upon the American Navy. It is merely a cold statement of fact. Street fighting was not confined, Admiral Sims, to the city of Cork, as you certainly must know. Our boys were in serious affrays in France and in England and in Scotland and at home. Of course their conduct was good. No American will question that statement. But the term must be used in a general way. You do not mean, Sir, that every man under you was impeccable. You yourself say that they taunted the Irishmen they met in the streets of Cork. Possibly you consider that good conduct. From a disciplinary sense, yes. But such taunts—and we question how much taunting there was—certainly would have been calculated to rouse those against whom they were directed. Such taunts may have led to fights. But certainly there was no pro-Germanism there.

"And the eternal woman question also played its part", you say. In that you are right. "Our men", you go on, "had much more money than the native Irish boys and could entertain the girls more lavishly at the movies and ice-cream stands". Really, Sir, that is amusing,—entertaining "lavishly" at movies and ice-cream stands"! How much money would it take to entertain "lavishly at movies and ice-cream stands", may we ask? If the American boys limited themselves to this sort of entertainment, their expenses in Cork could not have sadly depleted their funds, nor could its glamour,

as you charge, have tempted the girls to desert their former beaux.

But again you are unthinking, Admiral Sims, in suggesting that underpaid sailors had more money to spend than civilians. On this point, it would seem, further comment is unnecessary.

Now, the truth, Sir, is that our American boys did have more money to spend than the sailors of the English ships, and the English soldiers who were in Cork all through the war; and therein lies the truth regarding most of the trouble at Cork, which you have greatly exaggerated. We ask you to verify for yourself the following:

Practically all of the early trouble in Cork in which our American sailors were involved was trouble between them and the English.

Practically all of this early trouble originated and took place in or around public houses, where drinking had been indulged in.

What you stated, without reason, as to the situation between the American sailors and the Irish boys, is true as regards the American sailors and the English. Our boys, having more money than the English, did rival with them and did take away from them some of the women of the town.

Now, let us say just a few words in passing about some of those self-same young women. Or, after all, need we say anything? You yourself, Sir, give testimony to their character when you say that, after the city of Cork was declared out of bounds, these girls went down by train to Queenstown to be entertained.

Now, Sir, is that a common proceeding among the well-bred young women of a community? Would any upright father or mother allow a daughter to make a ten-mile railroad trip to a busy, naval base, unaccompanied, for the purpose of spending an evening—you yourself, Admiral Sims, say that they spent the evenings—with a crowd of sailors, even American sailors, who, on the whole, but not to a man, represented a high moral tone? And we say to you, Sir, that, had you been present when those late evening trains, and early morning trains, pulled out of Queenstown and arrived at Cork, you would have a better understanding today as to whether those young women were the daughters of respectable Sinn Fein townsmen of Cork or were, many of them strangers to the city and to Ireland. The Irish National Bureau is not speaking of all. There were, of course, hundreds of young women who went from Cork properly escorted, to see their friends among the American boys at Queenstown; but those, Admiral Sims, were not of the type around whom street fights center. When they entertained they entertained at home, not in the highways and byways of a city.

You go on, in your article, to tell about attacks on our American sailors; how sometimes one was set upon and beaten into insensibility; and how small groups of them were stoned "by Sinn Fein sympathizers." Always Sinn Fein, but never a proof of it.

The Irish National Bureau recalls one story of the stoning. Some time afterward when the newsboys of the streets, engaged in a strike demonstration, were driven off by the English-controlled police, they cried out tauntingly: "You didn't drive us off after you told us to throw stones at the recruiting office." Perhaps, Admiral Sims this may suggest who the stone-throwers really were, and whence came their promptings. There are stone-throwers the world over. There were stone-throwers in Boston a few weeks ago, when the police went on strike; and all of those stone-throwers, it will be testified to you, were irresponsible young hoodlums, minors every one of them.

Now, you say, "these chivalrous, pro-German agitators would rush up and attempt to tear the girls away from our young men." Again, Admiral Sims, you have spoken some truth. But this phase was a later one. This, Admiral Sims, is the truth: the trouble in this instance did not begin until a few young girls of the town lacking perhaps proper parental guidance and lured by a uniform, had become involved with some of our American boys who failed unwittingly to distinguish between the sophisticated and the innocent. There were night-rides into the countryside and disastrous endings. An organization of Vigilantes was formed among the respectable and substantial residents of Cork to put a stop to this unhappy development. It was not an organization hostile

to Americans, not one of offense, but one of defense, directed against those few to whom the noble ideals and traditions of our Navy meant nothing and to whom morality was a farce. These men did "tear the girls away", but the acts were born of charity, not of jealousy or lust, and were so few that it were better you had left them unmentioned. For this, remember, was a later and a minor phase.

Now, make no mistake here. The Irish National Bureau does not propose to give to every individual who shouts for Sinn Fein a clean bill of health. In Sinn Fein ranks, as in the ranks of the American Navy or any other organization of men, there must be some whose actions at times bring no credit to his fellow. But that Sinn Fein as a whole—the mass of the Irish people—or that Sinn Fein leaders, ever engaged in, encouraged or countenanced attacks on American sailors is absolutely false.

You tell of an American sailor striking an Irish "hooligan", who died following the affray. This young man was no "hooligan", Sir. He was, we believe, the respectable son of a retired sea captain. And because his assailant was acquitted by an Irish jury, you would have it appear that the majority of the Irish people approved of his act. That statement is an insult to the living and to the dead. The verdict, in truth, was rendered many months after the unfortunate happening, when conditions had been remedied and when the spirit of conciliation was high. May we suggest that it would have been fairer had you told the whole story—that a fund was raised for the father of the dead boy among the big-hearted American shipmates of the man who felled him, and that this fund never was handed over to the father. The money, we believe, was turned back to the donors by orders of someone higher up.

You say: "The action of this jury in itself indicated that there was no sympathy among the decent Irish element—which constituted the great majority—for this sort of tactics." Again it is very evident, Admiral Sims, that you are entirely unfamiliar with Irish conditions. You assume that "the decent Irish element—which constituted the great majority"—is different from Sinn Fein, whereas, in truth, the two are synonymous. May we point out to you that, in the last Parliamentary election in Cork city, there were cast 20,801 Sinn Fein votes, 7,480 Nationalist votes, and only 2,519 Unionist votes; and that, in the balance of the county, in the constituencies of North Cork, Northeast Cork, Mid-Cork, East Cork, Southeast Cork, and West Cork, Sinn Feiners were returned without opposition. Hence, not only is it demonstrated that "the decent Irish element—which constituted the great majority" and "Sinn Fein" are indeed the same, but that the only place in which American sailors were attacked, Cork city, was the only place in the entire county in which Unionism showed itself. In parts of County Cork that were solidly Sinn Fein—Queenstown, for instance,—the American sailors were safe. Does this indicate pro-Germanism of Sinn Fein?

You tell that a priest of Queenstown, who, in his Sunday sermon, denounced certain American sailors as betrayers of Irish womanhood, was punished by his Bishop by being assigned to duties at a distance from the American ships. Very true. But, will you note, Admiral Sims, that the Bishop of Cloyne is known in Ireland as a man inclined to English sympathies and with no great love for Sinn Fein. So it was no surprise when the Lord Bishop approached the British Admiral, apologized for the words of the clergyman, and later transferred him. The mistake, Admiral Sims, was that of the Bishop of Cloyne and not of the priest.

You continue: "Much to our regret, therefore, we had to issue an order that no naval man, British or American, under the rank of Commander should be permitted to go to Cork."

"OUR regret——"?! "WE had to issue an order——"?!

Who issued the order, Admiral Sims? It was not you, but Admiral Bayly of the British Navy, was it not? He, not you, was in command at that station. Your post was at 30 Grosvenor Gardens, London, S. W.

You say: "A committee of distinguished citizens . . . came to Admiralty House, to plead for the rescinding of this order. Admiral Bayly cross-examined them very carefully." Again, it is evident that Admiral Bayly, an Englishman, was the judge. It

was he who refused to lift the ban. You, Sir, merely "concurred in his decision". Thus we see, it was Admiral Bayly who declared Cork out of bounds—Bayly, a surly, English bulldog, by your own description of him.

And if there can be any doubt of the political animus behind the orders of Admiral Bayly restricting the movements of American sailors in Ireland, it should be dissipated by the happenings at Youghal. In that place was held a demonstration to celebrate the election of Arthur Griffith, now Vice President of the Irish Republic. Many American sailors participated in that jollification. They joined with the crowds, waving the tricolor of the Republic and singing Sinn Fein songs. And thereupon Admiral Bayly declared Youghal out of bounds.

And now, Admiral Sims, note this, for it is very important. You say that the reason Admiral Bayly refused to rescind the order barring our boys from Cork was:

> "It appeared that the men who had committed these offenses against American sailors had never been punished."

In that one sentence, Sir, you completely shatter your argument. If these men had never been punished, it was because they never had been caught. And who should have captured them but the English-controlled police? Failure to do so rests upon their shoulders alone. And. Sir, if they were never caught, never tried, and never punished, how can you or any other man on God's earth, save themselves alone, know their identity? And, if you do not know their identity, how can you truthfully say that they were Sinn Feiners?

The Irish National Bureau respectfully challenges you now to name, for the people of America and for the people of Ireland, a single man who participated in the affrays in the streets, who attacked our sailors who can be shown to be a Sinn Feiner.

Your whole statement, Admiral Sims, is a web of misinterpretation of fact, woven either of hearsay or of the stories of wily English agents.

Your very last paragraph says: "But the Sinn Feiners interfered with us in much more serious ways than this. They were doing everything in their power to help Germany. With their assistance, German agents and German spies were landed in Ireland." Except for Sir Roger Casement, who had no more to do with official Sinn Fein than did you, and, except for the man-in-the-collapsible-boat, whose early act on landing was to report to the British police, the Irish National Bureau again respectfully challenges you to name a single German agent who landed in Ireland or to give any evidence to prove pro-German plots on the part of Sinn Fein.

12. And now a word as to America. Your contribution is obviously an attempt to stem the rising tide of sympathy and support which is overwhelming Ireland's enemies the world over. It is an attempt to discredit President De Valera, who is being acclaimed by millions in America as a great leader in the cause of human liberty. If such was not your purpose, if you are indeed a lover of those noble principles upon which our Republic is founded, and a sympathizer with the oppressed peoples of the earth, why have you in telling your war experiences and of the alleged experiences of the men under you, jumped the broad Atlantic to attack a man who, since his arrival in America, has scrupulously refrained from giving offense to our government? Of those who might be presumed to speak with some degree of authority for the nation, you alone have stooped to assail this high-minded, self-sacrificing champion of the downtrodden, whose life has been devoted to his country's cause.

13. In closing, the Irish National Bureau again respectfully asks you to submit some substantial evidence to support your sweeping charges of pro-Germanism made against the Irish people; and we trust that if, on investigation, you find that your hypotheses are without foundation, you will make this fact known to the world.

Very sincerely,

DANIEL T. O'CONNELL,
Director.

November the eighth, 1919.

IRISH NATIONAL BUREAU
WASHINGTON, D. C.

November the seventh
1919

THE HONORABLE
JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

We transmit herewith copy of a letter which we are mailing today to Admiral William Sowden Sims, U. S. N.

Very truly yours,
WILLARD DELUE,
Chief, Section of Information.

WDeL-B

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
WASHINGTON

11 November, 1919.

MY DEAR SIR:

I have your letter of the 7th inst. together with the copy of your letter to Admiral Sims, for which I thank you.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

MR. WILLARD DELUE,
Irish National Bureau, Washington, D. C.

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE
NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND

12 November 1919.

FROM: Rear Admiral William S. Sims, U. S. Navy.

TO: Daniel T. O'Connell, Director, Irish National Bureau.

SUBJECT: Letter of November 8, 1919, from Mr. O'Connell concerning article in "The World's Work".

1. Received and contents noted.

(Signed) WM. S. SIMS,
Rear Admiral, U. S. Navy.

[To date, the Irish National Bureau has received no reply from Admiral Sims other than the foregoing acknowledgment.]

The "Glorious Indiscretions" of Admiral Sims

From: DANIEL T. O'CONNELL, Director, Irish National Bureau, Washington, D. C.

To: JOSEPHUS DANIELS, Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Subject: Activities of Admiral William Sowden Sims.

The Irish National Bureau feels called upon once again to address you on the activities of Admiral William Sowden Sims. It does not do so from any desire to involve you in a discussion which is as distasteful to this Bureau as it must be to you. But we believe that we would be remiss in our duties as American citizens and unfair to Admiral Sims himself were we to let pass without giving opportunity for explanation, a situation which may involve not only the future of the United States Navy, but of the very nation itself, its traditions and its policies. Admiral Sims, through his gratuitous attack upon the Irish people and upon the supporters of the Irish Republic in the United States, has drawn upon himself the spotlight of publicity; and, by glorifying one of his notable mistakes of the past, has justified a careful scrutiny of his more recent acts. The facts which the Irish National Bureau sets forth herewith can be verified by you from information which must be in the hands of the Navy Intelligence Department; and perhaps the Navy Intelligence Department may be able to explain, what we frankly can not, the strange circumstances by which an admiral of the United States Navy has identified himself with a movement which, in our estimation, is prejudicial to the best interests of the Navy and of the nation.

2. The Irish National Bureau respectfully calls your attention to the movements of Admiral Sims on the 3d day of May, 1919. On that day, you will find, he was feted by an organization which has headquarters in New

York City, but whose origin and whose guiding force is purely English. The spokesman for that organization publicly applauded Admiral Sims' pro-English declaration at the Guildhall in London in 1910, for which the Admiral at the time was officially rebuked; the official publication of that organization acclaimed him as a man "whose glorious indiscretion made him famous" and Admiral Sims himself was led to refer to the incident with some pride.

3. Now, Mr. Secretary, the organization with which Admiral Sims thus allowed himself to be identified is none other than the English-Speaking Union, one of the most active and one of the most potent organizations for English propaganda which the United States has had thrust upon it in recent years. The head of the English-Speaking Union is none other than Arthur J. Balfour, a cousin to the author of the covenant of the League of Nations, Lord Robert Cecil; a former First Lord of the English Admiralty and now Lord President of the Imperial Council. The chief American organizer of the English-Speaking Union is Major George Haven Putnam, who is English-born, and who received his commission as organizer while in England.

4. The English-Speaking Union, Mr. Secretary, is avowedly a propaganda organization. It makes no pretense of being anything else. Among its objects is the changing of American history as at present taught in our schools, so as to make future generations of our citizens believe that the American Revolution was either a terrible mistake or a blessing received from England, that the War of 1812 was a mere comic opera war, and that the best way to remedy the damage done in 1776 will be the making of a powerful Anglo-American compact. These, Mr. Secretary, are not our opinions. They are the bold statements emanating from officials of the English-Speaking Union themselves.

5. The ultimate end of all English propaganda is the establishment of a union, federation or other combination of Great Britain, the British dominions and the United States of America. There are, however, more immediate objects in view, objects which are of vital concern to you, as the head of the United States Navy, for among them is one which vitally affects our naval policy and our naval programme. These immediate objects apparently are: (1) A discouragement of large-scale naval-construction programmes by this country; (2) the surrender of Atlantic trade lines to English naval control; and (3) the placing upon the United States Navy or upon a combined Canadian-Australian-American fleet, the terrible naval burdens and the terrible problems which the world, and England in particular, sees confronting it in the Pacific. To carry out this programme, it is proposed by certain English propagandists that the fleets of England and the fleets of the United States BE BROUGHT UNDER SOME UNIFIED CONTROL.

6. Now, Mr. Secretary, bearing this in mind—and you, of course, can verify what we say from the files of your own Intelligence Department—we beg of you to look back again to this gathering in New York City on May 3, 1919, in which Admiral Sims was the central figure. Glance over the names of those who sat with him at the head table. Of a total of eighteen, thirteen were as follows:

(*a*) Paul D. Cravath, Toastmaster, Vice President of the Balfour-headed English-Speaking Union of England; who, in introducing Rear Admiral Sims, said that the English-Speaking Union was born in London July 4, 1918, but that Admiral Sims was after all, its real founder, because it was born of his Guildhall speech of 1910.

(*b*) F. A. McKenzie, editor of Viscount Northcliffs's London Times Weekly Edition and an active worker in the United States last year.

(*c*) Sinclair Kennedy of Boston, member of the Executive Committee of the English-Speaking Union; author of "The Pan-Angles", an open plea for a Pan-Angle Federation, and a suggestion for a naval cooperative union; active in the work of changing American history to suit English taste.

(*d*) Lt. Col. G. G. Woodwark, of the British Army, member of the Advisory Board of the English-Speaking World, the organ of the English-Speaking Union; attached to the British Ministry of Information as Director of War Literature, Books and Pamphlets in the United States; a member of the British War Mission to the United States, which was organized by Lord Northcliffe, chief of English propagandists.

(*e*) Hon. James M. Beck, a warm advocate

of drawing more closely the bonds which tie the United States and England.

(*f*) Hon. H. Y. Braddon, High Commissioner to the United States from Australia.

(*g*) Ian Hay Beith, member of the General Committee of the English organization of the English-Speaking Union, one of the most notable figures in English propaganda work in the United States; author of "The Oppressed English", a book widely circulated in America under direction of the Ministry of Information, which was so notoriously a mass of falsehood that its circulation was prohibited in England and Ireland.

(*h*) Lt. Col. Norman G. Thwaites, O.B.E., member of the Advisory Board of the English Speaking World, Assistant Provost Marshal for Great Britain in the United States; strong advocate of English propaganda in the United States; who suggests that American statesmen should be invited to sit in the House of Commons, especially during debates on international matters, and asks why British statesmen should not occasionally take a seat in the Congress of the United States, and even be invited to contribute to the debate on special occasions.

(*i*) Francis R. Jones, member of the General Committee and of the Executive Committee of Balfour's English-Speaking Union and treasurer of the English Section.

(*j*) Mr. Frank Dilnot, of the London Daily Chronicle, a paper whose name is inevitably bound up with the exposure of the British Dope Scandal, a story which was suppressed in the United States through the activities of the English Department of Information, of which Lord Beaverbrook was head, and following which the London Daily Chronicle changed hands.

(*k*) Frederick Villiers, English war correspondent.

(*l*) W. H. Gardiner, active in the affairs of the English Speaking Union and of pro-English propaganda in the United States; who declared publicly May 24, 1919, in Philadelphia: "On the Atlantic Ocean today, Britain is supreme, unrivaled and unchallenged. Never was her naval strength as great, and never were her mercantile prospects brighter. . . . You (Britons) are supreme on the Atlantic and will remain so. But the Merchant Fleet neither of Britain nor of the United States is supreme on the Pacific, where so much of our future lies. . . . In 1910 in London, Admiral Sims made a great and true prophecy when he expressed the purely personal opinion that if Britain's life were ever threatened she could count on the last man and the last dollar in the United States. I believe the same is true as to the safety and well-being of Britain in the Pacific."

(*m*) L. Lyons-Montgomery, of Philadelphia, Secretary of the English-Speaking Union, Recording Secretary of the United British Societies of Philadelphia and a prolific writer on pro-English subjects.

It was in such company, fairly reeking with the atmosphere of English propaganda, that Admiral Sims, on May 3, 1919, chose to speak. He could have shown no greater indiscretion had he taken the platform to argue for Lord Robert Cecil's League of Nations, to the adoption of which the English Speaking Union is committed.

7. And now, we beg of you, note what a Rear Admiral of the United States Navy had to say at this strange gathering. He said, among other things:

(*a*) That merchant sailors are superior to the men of the United States Navy;

(*b*) That men of the United States Navy are such land-lovers that they "remain ashore as long as they can until the Navy Department orders them out to sea." And, in addition to these complimentary references to the Navy, he said (N. Y. Times, May 4, 1919):

(*c*) "AN ENGLISH STATESMAN'S WORD IS HIS BOND."

8. It would seem, Mr. Secretary, that Admiral Sims' "glorious indiscretion" of the London Guildhall were duplicated in this audacious utterance of May 3, 1919, before Arthur J. Balfour's English-Speaking Union. How long since has the ranking officer of the United States Navy been either qualified or authorized to place a seal of approval upon the acts of foreign statesmen? It would seem to us that this were the duty of our State Department, not of the Admiral of the Navy. And employees of the State Department, as well as the thinking employees of your department, Mr. Secretary, are sufficiently versed in diplomacy and sufficiently gifted with good judgment to avoid such general characterizations or commendations as that voiced by Admiral Sims. And this statement that "a British statesman's word is his bond" is not only a grave indiscretion, but,

as history shows, it is a serious distortion of the truth.

9. We have merely outlined to you, Mr. Secretary, a situation in which an Admiral of the United States Navy has identified himself with English propaganda and English propagandists. We have mentioned but few names. The ramifications are far-spread and it is not unlikely that, through means at your disposal, they can be traced into the very bowels of our governmental system. Couple these things with Admiral Sims' subsequent writings upon Irish political affairs, and the whole presents an ugly picture, the more so when it is known that the firm which Admiral Sims selected to handle his anti-Irish propaganda is presided over by Mr. Frank N. Doubleday, and that this self-same Mr. Doubleday is a Vice President of the Balfour-guided, Balfour-sponsored, English-Speaking Union.

10. The Irish National Bureau is gratefu for your assurance of November 4, 1919, tha Admiral Sims will be very glad to correc any misstatements he may have made. Fror Admiral Sims, however, we have received n such assurances. May we, therefore, respectfully suggest to you that in view of the Admiral's record of "glorious indiscretions", i might be well if the Navy Department undertakes some sort of supervision of his forthcoming book on "The Victory at Sea" wit a view to guarding the Admiral from hi own unthinkingness?

Very truly yours,

(Signed) DANIEL T. O'CONNELL,
Director.

November the twenty-first, 1919.

Ireland's Contribution in the World War

Ireland not only did her full share in the war against Germany, but did a greater share of the work than might justly have been apportioned her. France and Belgium were her traditional friends, and she sprang to their defense.

When, in 1914, Asquith went to Dublin on a recruiting tour, the stand from which he spoke was decked with the ancient colors of the Irish Nation, and the appeals to the people were printed in Gaelic. Asquith gave assurance that England's sword would not be sheathed until the rights of small nations were assured—and then, in the same Fall, denied to Ireland the Home Rule which the British Parliament had pledged to her.

Yet, in spite of this perfidy on the part of the British governing ring, 6½ per cent of Ireland's total population enlisted under the British flag to offer their lives for the freedom of the oppressed and the destruction of the doctrine that Might is Right.

The full significance of this record of Ireland's service can best be understood if compared with the record of America. Available figures show on November 1, 1918, the total strength of the United States army and navy, including naval reservists and about 8,000 yeomen (f), to be 4,203,638 This is a fraction under 4 per cent of th total population of the country for 1918 So far as the Irish National Bureau can as certain, the men under arms, at home an abroad, at no time comprised 5 per cent o our population.

The statements regarding Ireland's wa service are based upon official utterance of the British authorities.

Lord Wimborne, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, reported to Lord Kitchener on January 14, 1916, that there were 51,046 Irish men serving as regulars and reservists i the British army in August, 1914. According to Sir Eric Geddes, in the House o Commons, there were, up to 1918, 170,000 enlistments in Ireland. According to th statement of T. P. O'Connor, M. P., afte a statistical survey, there were more tha 35,000 Irish boys temporarily employe away from home who enlisted in Englis and Scotch regiments in 1914-1915. According to Wimborne's report, there wer 8,546 Irishmen in the English navy. I 1918 there were more than 7,000 additiona enlistments in Ireland, and a conservativ estimate gives an addition of 4,000 navy an navy reserve enlistments. This gives us a

total of 275,592 Irishmen from Ireland fighting in the English army and navy in the war.

Even Lord Morris, late Prime Minister of Newfoundland, who is NOT IN FAVOR OF THE IRISH REPUBLIC, recently wrote: "Nothing could be more splendid than the part played by the Irish at the start. . . . The Victoria Cross proudly worn on the breasts of Irish soldiers shows that this is no boast, and the subsequent failure of Ireland to take her place, as she has always taken it, on the battlefields of the empire was due to that fatal policy pursued at the War Office—A POLICY IN WHICH EVERYTHING HUMANLY POSSIBLE WAS DONE TO MAKE RECRUITING MORE DIFFICULT."

But it was not alone the War Office tactics that checked recruiting after the first response. It was a matter of far deeper concern to the Irish Nation.

The latest statistics (1911) show that only three years before the war began there were in Ireland only 776,000 men, married and unmarried, fit and unfit, of military age. And in January, 1916, Lord Wimborne reported that there were then only 400,000 single men of military age in Ireland, and that of this total at least 252,000 were essential to agriculture, and that other vital industries would absorb another 48,000. This left a balance of only 100,000 single men, fit and unfit, available in Ireland for military service at a time when 3,000,000 Englishmen were safely ensconced in British factories.

This tremendous shortage of manpower in Ireland must be considered. For it has from earliest times been the English governmental policy to so conduct its Irish affairs as to wipe out the manhood (and the womanhood, as well) of that country.

ENGLAND WOULD HAVE THE IRISH SITUATION ADJUSTED BY MAKING IRELAND A NON-IRISH COUNTRY.

In 1844 Ireland had about 5,000,000 cattle and 9,000,000 people.

In 1914 Ireland had more than 10,000,000 cattle and only a little more than 4,000,000 people.

These figures are eloquent. England's administration of Ireland had obviously favored the raising of cattle and the extinciton of Irishmen.

Sinn Fein well knew this, and, after the first period of generous volunteering was over, determined to prevent a further diminution of Ireland's population; it blocked recruiting by declaring that the first duty of Irishmen in the battle for democracy was to preserve the safety and rights of Ireland, which had been waging this selfsame battle for more than 700 years. This could not be accomplished by the wiping out of the remaining handful of young Irish manhood.

If Ireland had recruited men at the rate that England would have had her do it—while Englishmen stayed at home—the Irish Nation would now be nearer extinction than Serbia or Belgium.

The British program of Irish enlistment, like the earlier British programs of evictions, throttled industries, artificially created famines and enforced emigration, threatened the Gaelic nation with death. Yet, in spite of this threat, Ireland did her share.

(The above is copy of a news bulletin issued by the Irish National Bureau.)

INDEX

A. Page

Able-bodied men in U. S. not in service ---------- 10
in Belfast ---------- 10
Asquith, Ex-Premier, speaks in Dublin on recruiting ---------- 18
says rights of small nations are to be assured ---------- 18

B.

Balfour, Arthur J., President of English-Speaking Union ---------- 16
Bayly, Admiral Sir Lewis, bars sailors from Cork ---------- 4, 13
hits at American sailors as Sinn Fein sympathizers ---------- 14
refuses to lift ban ---------- 4, 13
was in command of U. S. Destroyer Flotilla ---------- 11
Beck, Hon. James M., at Sims banquet ---------- 16
Beith, Ian Hay, propaganda in the United States ---------- 16
Braddon, Hon. Henry Y., Australian Commissioner ---------- 16

C.

Casement, Sir Roger, not connected with Sinn Fein ---------- 14
Cecil, Lord Robert, author of the "League of Nations" ---------- 16
Balfour's cousin ---------- 16
Cloyne, Bishop of, pro-English ---------- 13
transfers Queenstown priest ---------- 4, 13
Cork, City of, U. S. sailors attacked in 3, 4
casts huge Sinn Fein vote ---------- 13
cordial welcome to U. S. Destroyers' crews ---------- 3
English soldiers and sailors attack Americans ---------- 12
reason for attack ---------- 6, 11, 12, 13
street fighting not confined to ---------- 11
U. S. sailor accidentally kills man 13
U. S. sailors raise fund for victim's father ---------- 13
Cork County, solidly Sinn Fein ---------- 13
Cravath, Paul D., Vice President English-Speaking Union ---------- 16
lauds Sims ---------- 16

D. Pag

Daniels, Josephus, Letter from Irish Bureau to ----------
reply to Irish National Bureau from ----------
second letter of Irish National Bureau to ---------- 1
De Valera, President Eamon, attacked by Sims ---------- 3,
on Cork incident ----------
Dilnot, Frank, of the London Daily Chronicle ---------- 1
Doubleday, Frank N., Vice President, English-Speaking Union, Admiral Sims' publisher ---------- 1
Doubleday, Page & Co. (copyright notice) ----------

E.

England — factories — 3,000,000 men working in English factories ---------- 1
U. S. sailors attacked in ---------- 1
federation with U. S. aimed at ---------- 1
flag is emblem of Irish oppression 1
Irish enlistments in ---------- 1
Navy, Irishmen in ---------- 1
policy to wipe out Irish manhood ---------- 1
propaganda in the United States 5, 6, 16, 17, 1
sailors attacked in U. S. ----------
attack Americans in Cork ---------- 1
soldiers attack Americans in Cork 1
U. S. sailors attacked in ---------- 1
English-Speaking Union, The
Balfour president of ---------- 1
committed to League of Nations 1
officials of ---------- 16, 17, 1
propaganda organization ---------- 1
Sims speaks before ---------- 15 et sec
Enlistments—Ireland ---------- 7, 9, 18, 1
U. S. ---------- 7, 9, 18, 1
Evans, Captain, Royal Navy, Liaison Officer with Fleet ---------- 1

F.

France, U. S. sailors in affrays in ---------- 1

G. Page

Gardiner, W. H., active in English propaganda in U. S. 17
on Admiral Sims 17
on U. S. Navy 17
Geddes, Sir Eric, on Irish enlistments 18

H.

Hay, Ian Beith (see Beith).
Home Rule Bill, withdrawn 18

I.

Ireland, bulk of Irish troops Sinn Feiners 10
cattle on increase 19
contribution of,, in World War 19
enlistments voluntary 7
entitled to same exemptions as u. S. 10, 18, 19
gave proportionately more men in the war than the U. S. 10
population on decrease 19
shortage of man-power in 19
total man-power in 19
6.5 per cent of total population in English Army 9
36 per cent of men of military age in the English Army 7
Irish National Bureau 13
comments on Sinn Fein 13
protests to Secretary Daniels 5
Receives acknowledgement from Admiral Sims 15
tells the truth about the truth to Admiral Sims 3
transmits copy of letter to Admiral Sims to Secretary Daniels 15
writes a second letter to Secretary Daniels —

J.

Jones, Francis R., Treasurer English-Speaking Union 17

K.

Kennedy, Sinclair, of Boston, active in propaganda in U. S. 16

L.

Lyons-Montgomery, L. (see Montgomery, L. L.).

Mc.

McKenzie, F. A., editor London Times Weekly Edition 16

M. Page

Man-Power of Ireland 9, 19
Montgomery, L. L., active in English-Speaking Union 17
Morris, Lord, Premier of Newfoundland—Irish enlistment 9

N.

Nationalist Party, two representatives pledged to Irish self-determination 9
Northcliffe, Viscount, English propagandist 16

O.

O'Connell, Captain Daniel T., Director, Irish National Bureau—Who he is 8
on Irish enlistments in England and Scotland 18, 19

P.

Priest transferred at Queenstown (see Cloyne, Bishop of).
Putnam, Maj. George Haven, commissioned in England for work 16
organizer in U. S. for the English-Speaking Union 16

Q.

Queenstown, Bishop of (see Cloyne).
welcomes U. S. sailors 3

S.

Sailors (see U. S., England, etc.).
Scotland, Irish enlistments in 18
U. S. sailors in fight in 11
Shortt, Edward, proclaimer of plots 11
Sims, Rear Admiral William Sowden
acknowledges receipt of letter 15
activities on May 3, 1919 15
challenged to name Sinn Feiners 14
challenged to prove statements 11
contradicts himself 10, 11
did he write the article? 9
feted by English - Speaking Union 15
his attack 3, 9
his charges not supported 9
his post not in Ireland 13
identifies himself with English propaganda 18
insults living and dead 13
letter to, from Irish National Bureau 8

S — Page

Sims reads men's thoughts ---------- 10
reflects on U. S. Navy ---------- 17
says "an English statesman's word is his bond" ---------- 17
shatters his entire story ---------- 14
speech at English - Speaking Union ---------- 17
Sinn Fein, alleged plote ---------- 3, 5, 11
American sailors join with ---------- 14
bulk of Irish soldiers join ---------- 10
Irish National Bureau's comment on ---------- 13
never countenanced, engaged in or encouraged attacks on U. S. sailors ---------- 13
not proved ---------- 11
wins 73 seats in election ---------- 6, 9
why it blocked recruiting ---------- 19
Small Nations, rights of to be assured, says Asquith ---------- 18
Stone-throwing, Story of ---------- 12

T.

Thwaites, Lt. Col. Norman G., O. B. E., advocates English propaganda in U. S. ---------- 17
English Army ---------- 17
his plan ---------- 17

U.

United States History, English plan to change it ---------- 16
United States Navy, English propaganda directed towards ---------- 16
in the Pacific Ocean ---------- 16
joint control of ---------- 16
not every man above criticism ---------- 6
police patrols needed in America 11
sailor, behavior of ---------- 11
warmly welcomed in Ireland ---------- 3
W. H. Gardiner on ---------- 16
22 per cent of the men of military age in service ---------- 7
war record compared with Ireland ---------- 7, 9, 10, 18, 19

U — Pag

United States, sailors, barred from Youghal for pro-Irish demonstration ---------- 1
behavior of ---------- 1
did not have more money than civilians ---------- 1
fights with English in Cork ---------- 1
had more money than the English ---------- 1
members of Friends of Irish Freedom and allied societies ---------- 1
misconduct of a few ---------- 12, 1
money raised for father of victim turned back to donors ---------- 1
night rides with young girls ---------- 1
raise fund for father of Irish boy killed at Cork ---------- 1
wave Sinn Fein flags ---------- 1

V.

Vigilantes formed in Cork ---------- 12
not hostile to Americans ---------- 12, 13
Villiers, Frederick, English war correspondent ---------- 17

W.

Wimborne, Lord, on Irish recruiting 18, 19
Women, go to Queenstown to meet sailors ---------- 12
of Cork, Conduct of, with sailors 12
Sims' own testimony ---------- 12
strangers to Cork and Ireland ---------- 12
their part in trouble at Cork ---------- 10, 11
Woodwark, Lt. Col. G. G., English Army, active in propaganda in U.S. 16

Model Printing Company, Washington